Robert Scotlund Vaile PO Box 727 Kenwood, CA 95452 (707) 833-2350 Petitioner in Proper Person PROPER PERSON RECEIVED/ENTERED FEB 17 2010 TRACIE K. LINDEMAN CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ROBERT SCOTLUND VAILE,

Petitioner,

Supreme Court Case No: 55446 District Court Case No: 98D230385

vs.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK, AND THE HONORABLE CHERYL B. MOSS, DISTRICT JUDGE, FAMILY COURT DIVISION,

FILED

FEB 1 9 2010

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY DEPUTY CLERK

Respondents.

EMERGENCY MOTION TO EXPEDITE SUPREME COURT REVIEW OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR PROHIBITION

Petitioner, Robert Scotlund Vaile has filed a Petition for Writ of Mandamus or Prohibition seeking an Order from this Honorable Court prohibiting the Honorable Cheryl B. Moss, District Court Judge, Dept. I, Eighth Judicial District Court Judge Fare Invitesion from enforcing an expired judgment or from enforcing judgments for attorneys fees by requiring payments in interpleader as a FER 172010

-1-

10-01150

substitution for legal garnishment of his property. This order was issued on direct threat of criminal contempt against Mr. Vaile as of March 8, 2010. Petitioner respectfully requests that this Honorable Court or a single Justice of this Honorable Court review and rule on this motion immediately in accordance with NRAP 27(c).

Petitioner Vaile requests that this Court review the Petition on an Emergency Basis because the family court in question has issued a verbal order to Mr. Vaile that he must pay monies not in his possession into the family court by March 8, 2010. The payments are not for child support but for an order for attorneys fees that expired in June 2009 – unrelated to child support. The lower court threatened that if Mr. Vaile did not pay nearly \$5,000 by March 8, 2010, he would be held in contempt of court. Since Mr. Vaile does not have the funds to make this payment, he will be forced to file bankruptcy prior to March 8, 2010 or risk being imprisoned unless this Court intercedes immediately.

Accordingly, Petitioner requests this Court to issue appropriate stay orders and to otherwise act on the Petition urgently.

Respectfully submitted this 16th day of February, 2010

Robert Scotlund Vaile

PO Box 727

Kenwood, CA 95452

(707) 833-2350

Petitioner in Proper Person

Robert Scotlund Vaile PO Box 727 Kenwood, CA 95452 (707) 833-2350 Petitioner in Proper Person

4 5

6

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

7 1		
8	ROBERT SCOTLUND VAILE,	
0		Supreme Court Case No:
9	Petitioner,	District Court Case No: 98D230385
10		
11	vs.	
12	THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT	
13	COURT OF THE STATE OF	
14	NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK, AND THE	
15	HONORABLE CHERYL B. MOSS,	
16	DISTRICT JUDGE, FAMILY COURT DIVISION,	
17	Division,	
18	Respondents.	
1 Q		

AFFIDAVIT OF ROBERT SCOTLUND VAILE IN SUPPORT OF EMERGENCY MOTION TO EXPEDITE REVIEW OF PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

R. Scotlund Vaile, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Nevada, declares as follows:

- 1. I am the Plaintiff in this case.
- 2. I am making this Declaration in support of the Emergency Motion to Expedite Review of Petition for a Writ of Mandamus or Prohibition.

- 3. I have written with my own hand and am familiar with the contents of the petition and the emergency motion, and those matters that I do not have personal knowledge of, I state on information and belief.
- 4. I reside in Kenwood, California.
- 5. In April of 2002, this Court relinquished both personal and subject-matter jurisdiction of both Plaintiff and Defendant in this case based on the finding that neither party had ever resided in Nevada.
- 6. In July, 2003 the lower court entered an order for attorney's fees in the previous litigation surrounding the jurisdiction of the Nevada courts.
- 7. I have never received notice that this order was registered in any state where I have lived.
- 8. On June 16, 2009, Porsboll's counsel issued a Nevada writ of execution and garnishment to a Nevada branch of my California employer, Deloitte & Touche LLP ("Deloitte"), in an attempt to seize my California earnings.
- 9. I requested and obtained a California TRO prohibiting Deloitte from garnishing my earnings based on the writ of garnishment because that Nevada judgment had not been domesticated in California.
- 10.I understood the Nevada judgment to have expired in June 2009.
- 11.I received no notice regarding the judgment's renewal.
- 12. Since my employer, Deloitte, was restrained from garnishing my salary, the Nevada family court ordered me to "self-garnish," and to interplead 25% of my salary to the clerk of the court in payment of the 2003 attorney fee award or face criminal contempt on October 26, 2010.
- 13. Shortly thereafter, Porsboll's California counsel admitted in filings to the California court that the 2003 Nevada judgment had not, in fact, been renewed.
- 14. California counsel made assurances to me directly, both verbally and in email, that the Nevada garnishment would not be pursued.

- 15.Because of these assurances, I did not interplead funds to the family court in satisfaction of the 2003 judgment.
- 16.On February 3, 2010. the lower court entered a stipulation and order quashing the Nevada Writ of Garnishment based on the fact that the 2003 judgment had not been renewed.
- 17. The family court scheduled a show cause hearing for March 8, 2010 and required that I show cause for why I should not be held in contempt of court for not interpleading funds to the clerk of court in satisfaction of the expired order.
- 18. The family court ordered me to pay \$4,696.64 by March 8, 2010 or face criminal contempt sanctions.
- 19.I have remained current on child support payments since this court entered support orders in March 2008.
- 20.But I do have funds available to me to pay these additional amounts ordered by the family court, and will be forced to file bankruptcy or be subject to imprisonment on March 8, 2010 if this Court does not act.
- 21.I am respectfully requesting that Judge Moss be immediately prohibited by this Honorable Court from enforcing an expired order or requiring payment of funds on threat of contempt.
- 22. Further I say not.

Under penalty of perjury, State of Nevada.

Robert Scotlund Vaile